



## STATE OF INDIANA

MITCHELL E. DANIELS, JR., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

317 / 232-3053

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: September 10, 2012

To: Nate Day, Director of Strategic Sourcing  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Adam Thiemann, Strategic Sourcing Analyst  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 12-88  
Remediation Services

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "AD", is written over the "To:" line.

#### **Estimated Amount of Contract: \$231,369.00**

Based on the evaluation of our team, the following companies met the requirements of the RFP and are recommended to provide remediation services for the Indiana Department of Environmental Management.

- AECOM
- AEC Indy
- Arcadis
- ATC
- August Mack
- Baker
- EnviroCorp
- Heartland
- IWM CG
- Keramida
- Patriot

The Vendors may be requested to address hazardous substance or petroleum response activities, related to sites that are being managed by the State of Indiana. These include, but are not limited to, Superfund (SF), Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP), State Cleanup (SC), Voluntary Remediation Program (VRP), Site Investigation (SI), Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST), Brownfields (BF), Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA), and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action by the Office of Land Quality of the Indiana Department of Environmental Management. In general, these activities may include investigation, delineation, study, removal, and remediation.

The selected respondents will have the chance to compete for individual projects, as needed by IDEM.

The evaluation team received fourteen (14) proposals:

- AECOM
- AEC Indy
- Arcadis
- ATC
- August Mack
- Baker
- EnviroCorp
- Heartland
- IWM CG
- Keramida
- Patriot
- PSI
- Shrewsberry
- Troy Risk

The proposals were evaluated by IDOA and a six-member evaluation team according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (35 points)
- Price (20 points)
- Indiana Economic Impact (15 points)
- Buy Indiana/Indiana Company (10 points)
- Minority Business Participation (10 points)
- Women-Owned Business Participation (10 points)

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in section 3.2 ("Evaluation Criteria") of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

**A. Adherence to Requirements**

All proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. All respondents met these requirements and were then evaluated based on the business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality**

**Business Proposal**

For the business proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent's ability to serve the state regarding the following sections of the business proposal: company structure, company financial information, references, and experience serving similar clients.

## Technical Proposal

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent's ability to complete the requested tasks, staff and resources available for each task, experience and past performance with similar tasks and services, key personnel, Quality Management Plan, and safety performance information.

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of each respondent's proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal, Section 2.4, as well as specific questions that respondents were asked to respond to in the RFP and clarifications.

Results of the management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: First Round MAQ Scores**

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (35 Max)
AECOM	31.38
AEC Indy	30.04
Arcadis	33.00
ATC	32.33
August Mack	32.63
Baker	33.42
EnviroCorp	33.17
Heartland	28.08
IWM CG	31.96
Keramida	33.00
Patriot	32.79
PSI	10.79
Shrewsberry	10.83
Troy Risk	8.83

During business and technical proposal evaluation, the evaluation team observed the following regarding each respondent. This is not intended to be an exhaustive discussion of what the evaluation team considered, but attempts to highlight some of the primary considerations that led to the evaluation team's scores.

### **AECOM**

AECOM scored 31.38 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. The company provided a very detailed description of how they would accomplish each task listed in the scope of work. This company shows that it has experience in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**AEC Indy**

AEC Indy scored 30.04 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal adequately covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. The information provided in the proposal shows that it has experience in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**Arcadis**

Arcadis scored 33.00 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. This company shows that it has a lot of experience in dealing with remediation activities, particularly in ecological risk assessment and remedial investigation, and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**ATC**

ATC scored 32.33 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal adequately covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. This company shows that it has experience in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**August Mack**

August Mack scored 32.63 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. The human health risk assessment and community relations portions are particularly detailed and well done. This company shows that it has experience, experience with the State as well as private sector, in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**Baker**

Baker scored 33.42 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP in a very detailed manner. This proposal makes little use of subcontractors; the company is capable of doing most of the requirements in house. This company shows that it has experience in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**EnviroCorp**

EnviroCorp scored 33.17 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal adequately covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. This proposal does make use of multiple subcontractors. This company shows that it has experience in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**Heartland**

Heartland scored 28.08 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal adequately covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. The tasks could have been more detailed; there is a minimum of information in the proposal. This company shows that it has some experience in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**IWM CG**

IWM CG scored 31.96 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal adequately covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. The tasks could have been more detailed; there is a minimum of information in the proposal. This company shows that it has experience in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**Keramida**

Keramida scored 33.00 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP, though the UST tasks lacked detail. This company shows that it has experience with the State as well as private sector in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**Patriot**

Patriot scored 32.79 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal covers all of the requirements as set forth in the RFP. In particular, this proposal does an excellent job of describing the project planning and work plan development tasks. This company has good experience in dealing with the UST tasks as well. This company shows that it has experience in dealing with remediation activities and has the appropriate resources available to engage in remediation activities.

**PSI**

PSI scored 10.79 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. The proposal does not cover all of the requested information set forth in the RFP. The business proposal is incomplete, which does not allow the evaluation team to view the company's experience with similar clients and other governmental bodies. The proposal does not address many of the tasks in the requested technical proposal. This proposal does not show that the company has the necessary experience or resources to engage in remediation services.

**Shrewsberry**

Shrewsberry scored 10.83 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal does not provide all of the requested information as set forth in the RFP. The technical proposal does not specifically address the tasks that were listed in the scope of work. This proposal does not show that the company has the necessary experience or resources to engage in remediation services.

**Troy Risk**

Troy Risk scored 8.83 out of the possible 35 qualitative points. This proposal does not provide all of the requested information as set forth in the RFP. The technical proposal lacks detail and does not address all of the tasks listed in the scope of work. The business proposal was also lacking in detail. This proposal does not show that the company has the necessary experience or resources to engage in remediation services.

**C. Cost Proposal**

Each line item was scored individually by being normalized to one another (respondent to respondent), based on the lowest price evaluated. Within each worksheet in the Cost Proposal

Template (Attachment D) Excel workbook, the respondent's line item scores will be averaged and then each of the three (3) average scores will be weighted. Finally, the weighted average scores from each worksheet will be added together to formulate the respondent's Cost Proposal score. All respondents were given the opportunity to improve their pricing through a round of target pricing. The scoring for this step of the evaluation process is outlined below:

**Table 2: Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score (20 Max)</b>
AECOM	12.12
AEC Indy	18.59
Arcadis	12.48
ATC	18.33
August Mack	15.70
Baker	11.61
EnviroCorp	11.54
Heartland	18.84
IWM CG	17.65
Keramida	17.88
Patriot	17.50
PSI	17.66
Shrewsberry	12.33
Troy Risk	17.04

#### **D. Short List**

The Cost Scores were then combined with the First Round Management Assessment and Quality Scores to generate the total scores for this step of the evaluation process as described in the RFP. The combined scores out of a maximum possible 55 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Pre-Short List Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAO SCORE (35 Max)</b>	<b>Cost Score (20 Max)</b>	<b>Total Score (55 max)</b>
AECOM	31.38	12.12	43.50
AEC Indy	30.04	18.59	48.63
Arcadis	33.00	12.48	45.48
ATC	32.33	18.33	50.66
August Mack	32.63	15.70	48.33
Baker	33.42	11.61	45.03
EnviroCorp	33.17	11.54	44.71

Heartland	28.08	18.84	46.92
IWM CG	31.96	17.65	49.61
Keramida	33.00	17.88	50.88
Patriot	32.79	17.50	50.29
PSI	10.79	17.66	28.45
Shrewsberry	10.83	12.33	23.16
Troy Risk	8.83	17.04	25.87

There was a clear and natural break in the scores above between the first eleven respondents and PSI, Shrewsberry, and Troy Risk. These three respondents were eliminated from moving onto the final round of scoring. The remaining candidates were deemed viable for contract award and moved forward to the final evaluation steps – IDOA Indiana Economic Impact, Buy Indiana, and Minority and Woman-Owned Business Participation scoring.

#### D. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the remaining eleven respondents in the following areas – Buy Indiana (10 points), Indiana Economic Impact (15 points), and Minority and Women Business Participation (10 points each) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Buy Indiana, Indiana Economic Impact, and Minority and Women Business Participation information with the respondents.

**Table 4: Final Overall Evaluation Scores**

Respondent	Management Assessment/ Quality Score (35 max)	Cost Score (20 max)	Buy Indiana (10 max)	Indiana Economic Impact (15 max)	MBE (10 max + 1 bonus)	WBE (10 max + 1 bonus)	Total Score (100 max + 2 bonus)
AECOM	31.38	12.12	0.00	8.79	11.0	-1.0	62.28
AEC Indy	30.04	18.59	10.00	5.36	10.0	10.0	83.99
Arcadis	33.00	12.48	0.00	10.07	11.0	10.0	76.55
ATC	32.33	18.33	0.00	15.00	10.0	10.0	85.66
August Mack	32.63	15.70	10.00	5.46	10.0	3.8	77.54
Baker	33.42	11.61	0.00	4.29	10.0	10.0	69.31
EnviroCorp	33.17	11.54	0.00	7.71	10.0	-1.0	61.42
Heartland	28.08	18.84	10.00	5.57	10.0	10.0	82.49
IWM CG	31.96	17.65	10.00	6.96	10.0	10.0	86.57
Keramida	33.00	17.88	10.00	13.82	10.0	10.0	94.70
Patriot	32.79	17.50	10.00	8.74	11.0	11.0	91.03


### Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the state scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and to meet the needs of the state. The team evaluated proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be four (4) one year renewals for a total of eight (8) years at the State's option.

The following is the M/WBE Commitment for each selected vendor. The total commitment is what percent of the expected work will go to MBE or WBE subcontractors. Due to the unknown scope of work a project may include, the commitment percent may go to a variety of their M/WBE subcontractors, but must equal the overall commitment for each category.

Bidder Name	MBE %	WBE %	M/WBE Subcontractors
AECOM	16.00%	0.00%	Belmont Labs, DLZ, Integrated Environmental Solutions
AEC Indy	8.00%	8.00%	NS Services, Schneider Corp.
Arcadis	16.00%	8.00%	Ark Engineering, Belmont Labs, PCS Engineering
ATC	10.00%	10.00%	Ark Engineering, Belmont Labs, CTL Engineering, Etica Group
August Mack	11.00%	3.00%	Ark Engineering, Belmont Labs, Crane Environmental, DLZ, Laura Kopetsky, OAS Inc, Schneider Corp.
Baker	12.00%	8.00%	Accu-Air Surveys, Belmont Labs, ECT, K&S Engineers, IES
EnviroCorp	10.00%	0.00%	Integrated Environmental Solutions
Heartland	15.13%	8.64%	Ark Engineering, Blue Sky Engineering
IWM CG	16.00%	8.00%	Belmont Labs, GeoSolutions, Gurman Supply and Containers
Keramida	15.55%	8.00%	Belmont Labs, DLZ, Eastside Trucking, PCS Engineering, ReproGraphix, Schneider Corp.
Patriot	16.00%	16.00%	Belmont Labs, Durham Engineering, NS Services, Specialty Earth Sciences

  
Adam Thiemann  
Indiana Department of Administration  
Strategic Sourcing Analyst